



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion fix damages at any amount between the market value at the time of the conversion and the highest value before the trial. *Henderson v. Hollind*, 1 Ala. App. 400, 55 South. 323. There is much in favor of this rule; for the jury can so exercise their discretion as to prevent the defendant from reaping a profit by his wrongful act, and, at the same time, can by proper consideration of any peculiar circumstances so mitigate the damages as to work justice in every case. See SEDGWICK, DAMAGES, CHAPS. 11 and 12.

EVIDENCE—PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS—HUSBAND AND WIFE.—The defendant wrote letters to his wife in which he admitted his guilt of a crime for which he was indicted. Later the letters came into the custody of third persons. On the defendant's trial the letters were offered as evidence against him. *Held*, the letters were not admissible. *McCormick v. State* (Tenn.), 186 S. W. 195. See NOTES, p. 306.

INSURANCE—CONDITIONS—PAROL WAIVER.—The agent of the defendant insurance company, who knew that the premises insured were lighted by gasoline, issued the plaintiff a policy which contained a condition that it should become void if gasoline were used on the premises. A loss having occurred, the plaintiff sued to recover on the policy, and the defendant pleaded the breach of this condition. *Held*, the plaintiff can recover, since the defendant's agent will be deemed to have waived the condition. *Marx v. Williamsburgh City Fire Ins. Co.* (Mich.), 158 N. W. 1052. For principles involved, see NOTES, p. 317.

INSURANCE—CONDITIONS—VACANCY OF PREMISES.—A tenant house was insured with a condition in the policy that it would be void if the house became "vacant or unoccupied." The tenant moved his family into another house; but three or four days later, when the house was burned, there still remained some household effects, and upon the premises some chickens, and the tenant still had possession of the key. *Held*, the house was not "vacant or unoccupied." *Covey v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co.* (Cal.), 161 Pac. 35.

The weight of authority holds that when the insurance is taken out on a house occupied by a tenant, it is contemplated by the parties that there may be a temporary vacancy during the time required for the change of tenants, and, therefore, the policy is not vitiated thereby. *Roe v. Dwelling House Ins. Co.*, 149 Pa. St. 94, 23 Atl. 718, 34 Am. St. Rep. 595. See *Tracy v. Queen City Fire Ins. Co.*, 132 La. 610, 61 South. 687. The time allowed for the change of tenants is a reasonable time, considering all the surrounding circumstances. *Liverpool, etc., Ins. Co. v. Buckstaff*, 38 Neb. 146, 56 N. W. 695, 41 Am. St. Rep. 724. And see *American Central Ins. Co. v. Clarey*, 28 Ill. App. 195. It has been held, however, that the contract should be construed strictly, and hence that immediately upon removal of the tenant the policy becomes void. *Farmers' Ins. Co. v. Wells*, 42 Ohio St. 519; *Bennett v. Agricultural Ins. Co.*, 50 Conn. 420. Perhaps a majority of the cases hold, in accordance with the principal case, that the vacant or unoccupied clause does not